

**REMARKS**

The rejection of Claims 2,3,9,10,13 and 17-21 under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as anticipated by Booij

The Examiner rejected the above claims as anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,020,486 to Booij. The Examiner references the rejection as set forth in the previous action, and with the following additional comments. Firstly, the Examiner indicates that the reference teaches the reopolymerization of depolymerization products (at column 1, line 34). Secondly, as regarding Claims 9-10, the Examiner indicates that the pressure limitations of these claims are inherently met by the autoclave method of the reference.

In response thereto, Applicant respectfully looks to what it considers a fundamental difference between Booij and the instant case. Booij is directed to the depolymerization of polyamide material back to monomer; whereas, the instant case is directed to dissolving and partially depolymerizing the polyamide material in the solvent. This distinction is reflected in Applicant's main claim.

Regarding Claims 9-10, Applicant respectfully submits that inasmuch as Claim 9 depends from the main claim and Claim 10 depends from Claim 9 (which in turn depends from the main claim), and in view of the important distinction noted above relative to the extent of depolymerization, these claims are likewise different from the reference.

The rejection of Claims 3, 5-8, 11, 12 and 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentably obvious over Booij

The Examiner also rejected the above claims as unpatentably obvious over Booij. The Examiner indicates that Booij teaches depolymerization of polyamides as discussed earlier, although without explicit mention of the molecular weight of repolymerized products, anhydrous alcohols and mixtures of 90% of one component,

repolymerization methods and specific filtration media. Nevertheless the Examiner considers these features obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. Specifically the Examiner indicates that one of such skill can use known art methods to achieve molecular weights comparable to the original molecular weight; that it is obvious to use anhydrous alcohols when water is not desired; that there is nothing unusual in selecting mixtures of methanol and alcohol; and that there are many common filtration means so that buildup of insoluble material is an inherent feature.

Applicant respectfully submits that inasmuch as Booij is fundamentally different from the instant case as discussed earlier, any inferences to be drawn regarding what additional features reflected in the dependent claims that one of skill in the field might derive are likewise so limited. Applicant considers Booij as lacking for obviousness purposes in view of its different technical teachings. Booij does not disclose the process of the current case, and therefore one skilled on the art would not be in a position derive the features of the dependent claims by relying upon its teachings.

Concurrent submission of supplemental Information Disclosure Statement

Applicant has submitted together with this response a supplemental Information Disclosure Statement for consideration by the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,



**WILLIAM H. HAMBY**  
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT  
Registration No.: 31,521  
Telephone: (302) 992-3230  
Facsimile: (302) 992-3257

Dated: May 30, 2007